

Stephanie
Carr/R1/USEPA/US
05/02/2006 08:57 AM

To jcreem@corillian.com
cc Bob.Drake@erm.com, Kevin.King@erm.com, Gennady
Shteynberg <gennady.shteynberg@po.state.ct.us>,
"Quillen, Todd" <TQuillen@TechLawInc.com>
bcc
Subject former IntelliData property

Dear Mr. Creem:

I am the EPA contact for Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Corrective Action at the former IntelliData property located at 80 Pickett District Road in New Milford, CT. The attached draft letter provides feedback on plans to meet RCRA Corrective Action requirements at the property in response to a letter dated December 19, 2005 from ERM.

I would be interested in meeting with you and/or ERM, along with Gene Shteynberg of CT DEP and Todd Quillen, of TechLaw Inc.(a contractor to EPA) to discuss the draft letter. If possible, we would like to meet at the 80 Pickett District Rd. property. Here are some possible dates and times that we are available:

preferred date: May 16 (any time between 9:30 am and 4 pm)

other dates: May 9 at 2 pm, May 11 in the morning, May 23 at 2 pm, May 25 in the morning

Once we agree on a date and time, I will draft an agenda and send it to you and ERM for your input.

Please let me know what would work for you. Thank you,

Stephanie Carr
EPA - Region I
1 Congress Street, Suite 1100 (HBT)
Boston, MA 02114-2023
phone: 617/918-1363

RCRA RECORDS CENTER
FACILITY CEE ASSOC.
I.D. NO. CTD 044121697
FILE LOC. R-9
OTHER #105634



0605 draft letter on 050705 RTC.doc EIASOP-VOADIOX3.pdf



RDMS DocID

105634

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

May , 2006

Joshua A. Creem
General Counsel
Corillian Corporation
3400 NW John Olsen Place
Hillsboro, OR 97124

RE: Letter dated December 19, 2005
Former CEE Associates/InteliData Facility, 80 Pickett District Rd., New Milford, CT,
CTD044121697

Dear Mr. Creem:

Thank you for the letter dated December 19, 2005, prepared by Environmental Resources Management (ERM), which responded to comments made in my July 5, 2005 letter to Lynn Brogis of InteliData Corporation regarding RCRA Corrective Action requirements for the former InteliData facility at 80 Pickett District Road in New Milford, CT. The purpose of this letter is to provide EPA's feedback on the December 19, 2005 letter. For brevity, EPA's original comments from the July 5, 2005 letter have not been repeated. However, the section and numbering scheme from the July 5, 2005 letter have been maintained for ease in referencing the original comments.

Section I - EPA Comments on the October 2004 Annual Report of Status of Remediation

General Comments

1. InteliData's response to this comment is adequate. Acetone and 2-butanone will be included in future soil vapor analyses.
2. InteliData's response to this comment appears to be partially adequate. The response to comments commits to collecting additional samples from well MW-17, and potentially other Neeltran wells, to evaluate the stability of the overburden plume. However, it is not clear when and how often the Neeltran wells will be sampled or what steps will be taken to identify and sample wells other than MW-17 on the Neeltran property, especially considering the information provided in the response to Specific Comment 13 which indicates that monitoring wells MW-1, MW-7, and MW-8 at the Neeltran property may have been destroyed. Please identify the wells that will be sampled, specify when and how often they will be sampled, and list the parameters that will be analyzed. In addition, please propose a schedule for reporting analytical results from these well samples to

EPA. Documentation from the Neeltran property, included as Appendix D of the October 2004 Annual Report, also notes that several bedrock wells are located on the Neeltran property. Sampling of these bedrock wells, if intact and appropriately located, should be conducted as part of site characterization and to support the Environmental Indicator (EI) evaluation of the bedrock aquifer. Please identify which bedrock wells will be sampled and propose a sampling frequency and a schedule for reporting analytical results to EPA.

For all Neeltran wells for which sampling is proposed, please provide boring logs and/or well construction diagrams or any available information on the depth and construction of each well.

3. IntelliData's response to this comment is inadequate. IntelliData has not provided an approach for defining the extent of contaminants in bedrock groundwater and for evaluating stability of the bedrock plume. As previously noted, concentrations of TCE and 1,1-dichloroethene have historically exceeded Connecticut Remediation Standard Regulations (RSRs) criteria. Most recently, 1,1-DCE was detected in bedrock groundwater in well BR-5 at 160 $\mu\text{g/L}$, exceeding the Connecticut Surface Water Protection Criteria (CT SWPC), in June 2003. While it is noted that concentrations decreased in this well between 2003 and 2004, IntelliData has not provided sufficient evidence to support a conclusion that this change in concentrations is due to natural attenuation rather than other factors, such as migration of the contaminated plume or seasonal fluctuation (the 2003 sample was collected during the summer; the 2004 sample was collected in the winter). In its December 19, 2005 letter, IntelliData concludes that VOCs detected in well BR-5 are isolated. However, the December 19, 2005 letter does not mention that 1,1-dichloroethene was detected in well BR-3 at concentrations exceeding the CT SWPC in August 2001.

IntelliData is not proposing to even consider investigating the bedrock aquifer downgradient of the known areas of contamination until after they evaluate whether natural attenuation will adequately remediate the VOCs in bedrock groundwater. As VOCs exceeding regulatory criteria have been detected in bedrock groundwater, the nature and extent of the bedrock plume needs to be defined in order to adequately characterize the site. Even if future monitoring data does suggest declining VOC concentrations in existing bedrock wells on the facility property, such data will not address the question of the nature and extent of groundwater contamination in bedrock downgradient of the facility. Therefore, defining the nature and extent of bedrock groundwater contamination and determining plume stability should be considered an immediate goal. Please provide a proposed approach for defining the extent of VOC contaminants in bedrock groundwater and for evaluating the stability of the bedrock plume. If bedrock wells are located on the Neeltran property, sampling of these wells, if they are determined to be installed at acceptable depths and constructed with appropriate methods, may be acceptable in lieu of installing additional downgradient bedrock wells. As an additional note, any determination that bedrock contamination at the former IntelliData facility is from an off-site source will need to be adequately supported.

For monitored natural attenuation (MNA) to be evaluated as a remedial alternative for VOC contamination, a thorough demonstration of the mechanisms and rate associated with the natural attenuation will be required. In EPA's directive "Use of Monitored Natural Attenuation at Superfund, RCRA Corrective Action, and Underground Storage Tank Sites" (OSWER Directive 9200.4-17P, dated April 21, 1999), it is stated that "decisions to employ MNA as a remedy or remedy component should be thoroughly and adequately supported with site-specific characterization data and analysis. In general, the level of site characterization necessary to support a comprehensive evaluation of MNA is more detailed than that needed to support active remediation. Site characterizations for natural attenuation generally warrant a quantitative understanding of source mass; groundwater flow (including preferential pathways); contaminant phase distribution and partitioning between soil, groundwater, and soil gas; rates of biological and non-biological transformation; and an understanding of how all of these factors are likely to vary with time."

Three lines of evidence presented in the OSWER Directive (EPA, April 21, 1999) are to be used in combination to support the decision to apply natural attenuation. The lines of evidence are summarized as follows: 1) Historical ground water and/or soil chemistry data that demonstrate a clear and meaningful trend of decreasing contaminant mass and/or concentration over time at appropriate monitoring or sampling points; 2) Hydrogeologic and geochemical data that can be used to demonstrate indirectly the type(s) of natural attenuation processes active at the site, and the rate at which such processes will reduce contaminant concentrations to required levels; and 3) Data from field or microcosm studies (conducted in or with actual contaminated site media) which directly demonstrate the occurrence of a particular natural attenuation process at the site and its ability to degrade the contaminants of concern (typically used to demonstrate biological degradation processes only). Additional guidelines for evaluating natural attenuation can be found in EPA's *Technical Protocol for Evaluating Natural Attenuation of Chlorinated Solvents in Groundwater*, dated September 1998. If IntelliData wishes to consider monitored natural attenuation as a remedial alternative for this project, please propose an approach for collecting the data necessary to support its use.

4. IntelliData's response to this comment is partially adequate. IntelliData has noted that "detection limits will be a concern when the assessment of compliance is performed following remediation." However, detection limits are a current concern for any existing data being used to evaluate whether the facility has achieved the Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control Environmental Indicator. In addition, detection limits will be a concern for any data used to make decisions about future site characterization (such as dropping constituents or monitoring points from future evaluation) and for any data used to support an evaluation of remedial alternatives, particularly for evaluation of monitored natural attenuation.

In the Quality Assurance Project Plan, which IntelliData is preparing, reporting limits should be compared to project action limits. As the QAPP will set forth performance standards to be achieved in order for data to be accepted as "valid," EPA is not

commenting, at this time, on IntelliData's statement in the December 19, 2005 letter that "if no detection limit exceeds the published RSR criteria for a specific compound, the data will be accepted as valid."

In preparation of the QAPP, please be aware that a project action limit for 1,4 Dioxane should be based on EPA Region 9 Preliminary Remediation Goals, found at <http://www.epa.gov/region09/waste/sfund/prg/files/04prgtable.pdf>. While the CT RSRs have Groundwater Protection Criteria and residential and industrial/commercial Direct Exposure Criteria for 1,4 Dioxane, the CT RSR criteria for 1,4 Dioxane are substantially higher than the corresponding EPA Region 9 PRGs. It is EPA's understanding that the reason for the difference is that the CT RSR criteria for 1,4 Dioxane only consider non-cancer effects, whereas the EPA Region 9 PRGs for 1,4 Dioxane are based on cancer risk. EPA Region I recommends the use of the EPA Region I 1,4 Dioxane analytical method for groundwater (enclosed). As the Region 9 PRG for groundwater is only slightly above the typical reporting limit, EPA Region I's lab has developed a series of Performance Evaluation (PE) samples, which are provided free of charge. I would recommend having your lab run these if you plan on analyzing groundwater samples. If you are interested in getting these PE samples, please let me know and I can put you in touch with the person who handles them.

5. IntelliData's response to this comment appears to be adequate. The additional sampling results were reviewed, and it appeared that only TPH and cyanide were identified above applicable CT RSR criteria. Cyanide was detected in only one sample (AOC-9 B6d) above the pollutant mobility criteria; however, a subsequent groundwater sample collected from nearby well ERM-14 did not report cyanide concentrations above the laboratory detection limit. Although this well did not report cyanide above the SWPC, it should continue to be monitored for cyanide as operation of the remediation system or other conditions may mobilize previously immobile constituents. Furthermore, areas downgradient of the vault area should continue to be monitored for cyanide, particularly since some onsite wells have reported cyanide concentrations just below the SWPC. Well ERM-10, further downgradient of the vault area, reported a cyanide concentration of 0.0292 mg/l in the February 2004 sampling event (SWPC = 0.052 mg/l).

Specific Comments

6. IntelliData's response to this comment appears to be adequate.
7. IntelliData's response to this comment is partially adequate. While it is recognized that trichloroethene (TCE) is a major constituent of concern, it is equally important to address any changes that occur with respect to other volatile organic compounds (VOCs) as they may aid in an evaluation of attenuation processes. Additionally, any figures depicting TCE or other contaminants of concern should be appropriately labeled.
8. IntelliData's response to this comment appears to be adequate.

9. IntelliData's response to this comment is partially adequate. Please provide the plan and schedule for semi-annual groundwater monitoring (i.e., when sampling will be performed and when results will be reported to EPA), identify the wells to be monitored and the parameters to be analyzed. Additionally, please clarify whether access to other wells on the Neeltran property (other than MW-17) has already been obtained. The response to General Comment No. 2 indicates that future sampling from the MW-17 monitoring point "and others" was anticipated.
10. IntelliData's response to this comment appears to be adequate.
11. IntelliData's response to this comment appears to be adequate. A layout identifying the areas of concern (AOCs) on-site will be expected in the next submitted document.
12. IntelliData's response to this comment is adequate. A revised figure has been submitted.
13. IntelliData's response appears to be adequate. An access agreement has been negotiated with the Neeltran property and future sampling at this site is anticipated. Please respond to Comments # 2 and 3 of this letter, which request specifics with regard to future well sampling on the Neeltran property.
14. IntelliData's response to this comment appears to be adequate. A revised figure has been submitted.

Errata

15.-18. It appears that comments 15 through 18 have been addressed appropriately.

Section II - Issues Raised in Previous Correspondence

19. The response to this comment appears to be partially adequate. The attached September 30, 2005 memo, addressed to Mr. Barry Keller of Teddy & Arthur Edelman, LTD, indicates that "VOCs in soil vapor are and will be present beneath the floor slab until completion of the remedial process." However, the memo did not mention that these VOCs from subsurface contamination may be entering the indoor air in the facility building. As requested in the completed Current Human Exposures Under Control checklist for 80 Pickett District Drive, IntelliData must provide written notice, to the current owner of the 80 Pickett District Drive facility, that VOCs from subsurface contamination may be entering indoor air in the facility building. In addition, IntelliData must provide a copy of this notice to EPA. Please provide such written notice to the current facility owner and provide a copy of this notice to EPA within 60 days of the date of this letter.
20. The response to this comment is partially adequate. IntelliData has included geologic cross sections of the site; however, it would also be useful if the cross sections could show the screened intervals of the overburden wells or the depths at which open

boreholes are observed in the bedrock wells. Groundwater level information, if not included on the cross-section, should be included in a table so that this information can be cross-referenced with the geologic cross-sections.

Section III - Next Steps

Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control Environmental Indicator Data Gaps

- *Assessing the Stability of the Overburden Plume:* InteliData's response to this comment is partially adequate. InteliData has indicated that an access agreement has been negotiated with the Neeltran property so that additional samples can be collected from off-site monitoring well MW-17. InteliData should clarify whether it will be able to sample the additional wells at the site, as additional data can be used to further support a determination of plume stabilization in overburden groundwater.
- *Defining the Extent and Assessing the Stability of the Bedrock Groundwater Contaminant Plume:* InteliData has not responded adequately to this comment. Additional delineation of the bedrock plume has not been proposed. Refer to the Section I of this letter, General Comments, for more information and requests for additional information relative to bedrock aquifer contamination.
- *Monitoring Groundwater to Verify that Migration of Groundwater Contaminant Plume has Remained Stable:* InteliData's response to this comment appears to be inadequate. EPA made specific requests with respect to proposed groundwater monitoring for the groundwater EI, but InteliData has failed to provide most of the requested information. As previously stated, please identify the wells at which groundwater contaminant concentrations will be monitored and specify the parameters for which groundwater samples will be analyzed. Additionally, please specify which wells will be monitored at the Neeltran facility.

The schedule also notes that sampling will be conducted semi-annually for the first two years of the remediation system operation. Please, specify the months when this semi-annual sampling will be conducted and when results from each round are expected to be submitted to EPA.

Quality Assurance Project Planning

The response to this comment is adequate provided that InteliData submit a QAPP prior to the next round of groundwater sampling.

Schedule

InteliData's response to this comment is inadequate. As previously noted, InteliData has not proposed additional investigations to delineate the extent of bedrock aquifer contamination or to determine plume stability in either the overburden and bedrock aquifers. Additionally, InteliData has not provided a target date for submittal to EPA of a completed Documentation of Environmental Indicator Checklist documenting achievement of the Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control EI. A scheduled date for submittal of a QAPP has also not been specified, other than to note that it would be submitted before the next round of groundwater sampling. InteliData has not specified scheduled dates for the additional work necessary in order for a site-wide remedy decision to be made for the site. Before a site-wide remedy decision can be made, the nature and extent of contamination must be fully characterized. Please revisit the requested items in EPA's July 5, 2005 letter, and provide a schedule for the anticipated completion of those activities.

Within 60 days of the date of this letter, please provide, to EPA, the information requested in this letter. In addition, please copy both Gene Shteynberg, CT DEP and me on future correspondence related to investigation and remediation at 80 Pickett District Rod. Please feel free to contact me at 617/918-1363 if you have any questions on this letter.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Carr
RCRA Facility Manager

cc: Kevin King, ERM
Bob Drake, ERM
Gene Shteynberg, CT DEP